



An
Bord
Pleanála

Inspector's Report

ABP-322373-25

Development	Construction of house, a garage, a waste water treatment system with all associated site works
Location	Ballykeroge, Stradbally, Kilmacthomas, Co. Waterford
Planning Authority	Waterford City and County Council
Planning Authority Reg. Ref.	2560083
Applicant(s)	Kieran Fennell & Nikita Murphy
Type of Application	Permission
Planning Authority Decision	Refuse permission
Type of Appeal	First Party
Appellant(s)	Kieran Fennell & Nikita Murphy
Observer(s)	None
Date of Site Inspection	01 st July 2025
Inspector	Bernadette Quinn

1.0 Site Location and Description

- 1.1. The appeal site comprises an area of 0.34ha which forms part of a larger agricultural field. Site boundaries comprise a hedgerow to the west and a grassed bank to the north beyond which is a local road, L7017.
- 1.2. The pattern of development in the area comprises detached houses and agricultural lands. There are three existing detached dwellings located to the west of the site and the site is separated from these existing dwellings by an agricultural field. There are additional detached dwellings further east and west on the local road. The Dalligan river is located approx. 450m south of the appeal site. The site is approx. 3km east of the N25 road, 10km northeast of Dungarvan and 40km southwest of Waterford City.

2.0 Proposed Development

- 2.1. Permission is sought for the construction of a new single storey house with a gross floor area of 172 sq.m., a garage, a waste water treatment system and an entrance along with all associated site works.

3.0 Planning Authority Decision

3.1. Decision

- 3.1.1. On 09th April 2025 the planning authority issued notification of decision to refuse permission for one reason as follows:

It is the policy of Waterford City and County Council, as set out in Volume 1 Section 7.11.4 of the Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022-2028 to ensure that the Planning Authority avoid the creation of ribbon development (defined as five or more houses existing on any one side of a given 250 metres of road frontage) and assess whether a given proposal will contribute to and/ or exacerbate such ribbon development. The proposed development would create an infill site and would enable ribbon development thereby exacerbating a suburban form of linear development within a rural area. The proposed development would, taken in conjunction with existing development, enable undesirable ribbon development in a rural area, which

would further detract from the amenities and rural character of the area. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy Objective H 29 of the Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022-2028 and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

3.2. Planning Authority Reports

3.2.1. Planning Reports

The Planning Officers report dated 08/04/2026 can be summarised as follows:

- The proposed design is in accordance with relevant rural housing design policy and guidance;
- The proposed dwelling will be the 4th house within a c. 235 metre stretch on one side of the road
- The Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines define ribbon development as being areas which exhibit characteristics such as a high density of almost continuous road frontage type development, for example where 5 or more houses exist on any one side of a given 250 metres of road frontage. It is noted that to grant the proposed dwelling would subsequently create an infill site to the west which would result in the potential for ribbon development in this rural location. The Planning Authority would have serious concerns in relation to the creation of an infill site and the potential for creation of ribbon development in this rural location.
- The applicant has provided a supplementary rural housing form in support of the application which is accompanied by a letter of support from the applicant, a letter confirming the applicant's attendance at a local national school, a letter from their current employer, land registry details and a map indicating the proposed site in the context of the family home, c. 3.8km away. The applicant is not the landowner and is stated to be buying the site subject to planning permission.
- Based on the information submitted, the applicant has demonstrated a local housing need in accordance with Section 7.11.2 of the development plan.

- In relation to site access, the comments of the district engineer are noted which state that the sight lines can be achieved with the set back of the boundary on the drawing.
- A new septic tank and percolation area are proposed and water supply is proposed via a bored well.
- It is recommended that permission be refused.

3.2.2. Other Technical Reports

Engineers Report: No objections raised.

3.3. Prescribed Bodies

None on file

3.4. Third Party Observations

One no. third party observation received from Garvan Cummins can be summarised as follows:

- As the owner of the adjoining site to the west on which the observer will be seeking planning permission in the future, the submission seeks to ensure that future potential planning application on the observers lands will not be compromised or affected by other proposed developments in the area such as this application.

4.0 Planning History

No recent relevant planning history.

5.0 Policy Context

5.1. Development Plan

- 5.1.1. The Waterford City and County Development Plan 2022-2028 is the relevant development plan for the area. It has regard to national and regional policies in respect of rural housing policy.

5.1.2. The site is not located within a settlement boundary and is zoned 'Agriculture: To provide for the development of agriculture and to protect and improve rural amenity.

5.1.3. The appeal site is situated within an 'Area Under Strong Urban Influence'. Of relevance is Policy Objective H 28 which states 'We will facilitate the provision of single housing in the countryside, in rural areas under urban influence, based on the core consideration of demonstrable economic, social or local need to live in a rural area, as well as general siting and design criteria, as set out in this plan and in relevant statutory planning guidelines, having regard to the viability of smaller towns and rural settlements'.

5.1.4. Housing Need is defined as follows:

Persons with an economic need to live in the particular rural area would include those whose employment is intrinsically linked to the rural area in which they wish to build (e.g. farming, horticulture, forestry, bloodstock, fishing or other similar rural employment) and who require a dwelling to meet their own housing needs close to their place of work.

Persons with a demonstrable social need to live a particular local rural area would include those that have lived a substantial period of their lives (7 years or more) in the local rural area and who require a dwelling to meet their own housing needs close to their families and to the communities of which they are part. A local area for the purpose of this policy is defined as an area generally within a 10km radius of the applicant's former place of residence. This rural housing policy will apply equally to those living in the local area, who require a new dwelling to meet their own housing need, as well as returning emigrants wishing to establish a permanent residence for themselves and their families in their local community.

5.1.5. Section 11.7.4 refers to ribbon development and states:

The Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2005) define ribbon development 'where five or more houses exist on any one side of a given 250 metres of road frontage' and recommend against the creation/ perpetuation of ribbon development for a variety of reasons relating to road safety, future demands for the provision of public infrastructure as well as visual impacts.

When considering a proposal for development we will have due regard to the provisions of the Guidelines, the history and pattern of development in the area and the following policy:

H 29: Ribbon Development Policy Objective: We will avoid the creation of ribbon development (defined as five or more houses existing on any one side of a given 250 metres of road frontage) and will assess whether a given proposal will contribute to and/ or exacerbate such ribbon development, having regard to the following:

- i. The type of rural area and circumstances of the applicant.
- ii. The degree to which the proposal might be considered infill development.
- iii. The degree to which existing ribbon development would coalesce as a result of the proposed development.
- iv. Local circumstances, including the planning history of the area and development pressures.

5.1.6. The site is situated within a 'Low Sensitive' Scenic Classification in the Landscape and Seascape Character Assessment.

5.2. Ministerial Guidelines

5.2.1. Sustainable Rural Housing Guidelines for Planning Authorities (2005): These guidelines recommend against the creation of ribbon development for a variety of reasons relating to road safety, future demands for the provision of public infrastructure as well as visual impacts. In assessing individual housing proposals in rural areas planning authorities will therefore in some circumstances need to form a view as to whether that proposal would contribute to or exacerbate ribbon development. Taking account of the above and the dispersed nature of existing housing in many rural areas, areas characterised by ribbon development will in most cases be located on the edges of cities and towns and will exhibit characteristics such as a high density of almost continuous road frontage type development, for example where 5 or more houses exist on any one side of a given 250 metres of road frontage. Whether a given proposal will exacerbate such ribbon development or could be considered will depend on:

- The type of rural area and circumstances of the applicant,

- The degree to which the proposal might be considered infill development, and
- The degree to which existing ribbon development would be extended or whether distinct areas of ribbon development would coalesce as a result of the development.

Planning authorities will need to arrive at a balanced and reasonable view in the interpretation of the above criteria taking account of local circumstances, including the planning history of the area and development pressures.

5.3. Natural Heritage Designations

The closest designated sites are:

- Stradbally Woods proposed NHA is located 2km east of the site.
- Mid-Waterford Coast SPA (Site Code 004193) is located 2.3km southeast of the site
- Glendine Wood SAC (Site Code 002324) is located 4.2km west of the site.

5.4. EIA Screening

The proposed development has been subject to preliminary examination for environmental impact assessment (refer to Form 1 and Form 2 in Appendices of this report). Having regard to the characteristics and location of the proposed development and the types and characteristics of potential impacts, it is considered that there is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment. The proposed development, therefore, does not trigger a requirement for environmental impact assessment screening and an EIAR is not required.

6.0 The Appeal

6.1. Grounds of Appeal

- 6.1.1. One no. first party appeal against the Planning Authority's decision to refuse permission has been received. The grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows:

- No concerns relating to ribbon development were raised at a pre-planning meeting relating to the proposed development. A record prepared on behalf of the applicant by Cllr Damein Geoghegan is attached to the appeal.
- The planners report incorrectly notes that no pre-planning meeting took place.
- No formal pre-planning meeting report was issued to the applicants by Waterford County Council.
- An observer to the planning application who raised concerns relating to ribbon development has done so with the intention of speculatively selling his land subject to planning permission.
- The refusal relates to concern that the granting of permission would create an infill site to the west of the appeal site which could lead to ribbon development if permission was granted on the adjoining site. This hypothetical reason for refusal could set an undesirable precedent for other similar decisions.
- There are three dwellings constructed on the western side of the site and the proposed house would be the fourth house on one side of the road over a 237m stretch of public roadway. A map is enclosed in this regard.
- Section 9.1 of the Development Plan states ribbon development is defined as where 5 or more houses exist on any one side of a given 250 metres of road frontage. There are three existing houses in place at this 250m stretch of public roadway.
- In relation to section 7.11.4 of the development plan, the site is in an area of low sensitive scenic classification and the applicant has satisfactorily demonstrated local need; the proposal is not an infill development, there is no existing ribbon development, and the owners of adjoining lands have no housing needs.

6.2. Planning Authority Response

A response from the Planning Authority can be summarised as follows:

- The pre planning consultation was considered in the assessment of the planning application.

- As noted in Section 247 (3) of the Planning and Development Act, pre planning consultation shall not prejudice the performance of the Planning Authority in carrying out its functions.
- The decision to refuse permission was appropriate as the proposal would create an infill site to the west which would create an opportunity for ribbon development to arise which would be contrary to objective H29 of the Development Plan.
- No new issues have been raised in the appeal to warrant a deviation from this viewpoint.

7.0 Assessment

- 7.1. Having examined the application details and all other documentation on file, including all of the submissions received in relation to the appeal, the reports of the local authority, and inspected the site, and having regard to relevant local/regional/national policies and guidance, I consider that the main issue in this appeal relates to the planning authority's reason for refusal.
- 7.2. The policies relevant to the appeal before the Board contained in the Development Plan are Policy Objectives H28 (local housing need and design criteria) and H29 (ribbon development). I note from documents submitted with the planning application that the applicant has demonstrated a housing need within the rural area as provided for in Section 7.11.2 of the Development Plan and this is not disputed by the Planning Authority.
- 7.3. I consider the main issue for consideration relates to compliance with Development Plan Policy Objective H29. Within the vicinity of the appeal site on the southern side of the L7017 there are three existing dwellings and an agricultural field immediately to the west of the appeal site. The proposed dwelling would be the fourth house within a distance of approx. 180m along this stretch of road. Additionally, there is a dwelling approx. 180m from the appeal site to the east and a dwelling approx. 315m from the appeal site to the west on the same side of the road as the appeal site. Having regard to the criteria outlined under Policy Objective H29 I note the following:

- (i) The appeal site is located within an 'Area under strong urban influence' and the applicant has outlined a rural housing need based on his family home and place of employment located approximately 3.8km of the appeal site.
- (ii) I do not consider the proposal is considered infill development, noting that there is no development on the sites immediately to the west and the closest dwelling to the east is approximately 180m from the appeal site.
- (iii) I do not consider ribbon development would coalesce as a result of the proposed development.
- (iv) In relation to local circumstances, I note that there is no recent relevant planning history on the appeal site or immediately adjoining sites. I do note that the wider area surrounding the appeal site is characterised by one off rural dwellings and the site is located approximately 3km east on the N25 road, 10km northeast of Dungarvan and 40km southwest of Waterford City. In particular I note the presence of three existing dwellings located approx. 60m to the west separated from the appeal site from a field which the planning authority refers to as an infill or gap site, and which the planning authority state that if developed, would result in the creation of ribbon development at this location. I also note that there is a dwelling approx. 315m further west and approx. 180m to the east. Having regard to these local conditions I consider the area is subject to development pressures.

7.4. Having regard to the above, I consider that the proposal, when taken in conjunction with existing development in the vicinity of the site, would result in the extension of an existing pattern of suburban development at this location and contribute to the creation of ribbon development in an open rural area which would be contrary to policy objective H29 of the Development Plan. I do not agree with the first party that refusing permission for development on this site creates an undesirable precedent for other similar decisions, noting that Policy Objective H29 refers to the need to assess whether a given proposal will contribute to and/or exacerbate ribbon development having regard to matters including development pressures in the area.

Having regard to my assessment above I consider that permission should be refused.

- 7.5. In relation to the first party's case that the issue was not raised at a pre-planning consultation, I note that the section 247 of the Planning and Development Act states that pre planning consultations are for the purposes of providing information in relation to the procedures involved in considering a planning application, including any requirements of the permission regulations, and, as far as possible, to indicate the relevant objectives of the development plan which may have a bearing on the decision of the planning authority. The Act states that the carrying out of consultations cannot, however, prejudice the performance by a planning authority of any other of its functions and I do not consider the fact that the issue was not raised during pre-application consultation to be relevant grounds for overturning the decision of the Planning Authority.

8.0 AA Screening

- 8.1. I have considered the proposed development of a dwelling and associated site works in light of the requirements S177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 as amended. The closest Natura 2000 sites are Mid-Waterford Coast SPA (Site Code 004193) located 2.3km south east of the site and Glendine Wood SAC (Site Code 002324) located 4.2km west of the site.

- 8.2. The proposed development comprises the construction of house, a garage, a waste water treatment system with all associated site works. No nature conservation concerns were raised in the planning appeal.

8.3. Screening Determination

Finding of no likely significant effects

In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on any European Site(s) in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is

therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required (refer to Appendix 3).

This determination is based on:

- The nature and scale of the works
- Location-distance from nearest European site and lack of direct connections between the application site and the SAC/SPA
- Taking into account screening determination by the PA.

9.0 Water Framework Directive Assessment

9.1. I have assessed the development proposed at the site in Ballykeroge and I have considered the objectives as set out in Article 4 of the Water Framework Directive which seek to protect and, where necessary, restore surface & ground water waterbodies in order to reach good status (meaning both good chemical and good ecological status), and to prevent deterioration (refer to Appendix X). surface and/or groundwater water bodies either qualitatively or quantitatively.

9.2. I conclude that on the basis of objective information, that the proposed development will not result in a risk of deterioration on any water body (rivers, lakes, groundwaters, transitional and coastal) either qualitatively or quantitatively or on a temporary or permanent basis or otherwise jeopardise any water body in reaching its WFD objectives and consequently can be excluded from further assessment.

10.0 Recommendation

10.1. I recommend that permission be refused for the reasons and considerations set out below.

11.0 Reasons and Considerations

The proposed development, taken in conjunction with existing development, would contribute to the creation of ribbon development and exacerbate a suburban form of linear development within a rural area. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy Objective H 29 of the Waterford City and County Development

Plan 2022-2028 and would be contrary to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.

I confirm that this report represents my professional planning assessment, judgement and opinion on the matter assigned to me and that no person has influenced or sought to influence, directly or indirectly, the exercise of my professional judgement in an improper or inappropriate way.

Bernadette Quinn
Planning Inspector

02nd July 2025

Form 1 - EIA Pre-Screening

Case Reference	ABP-322373-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of house, a garage, a waste water treatment system with all associated site works
Development Address	Ballykeroge, Stradbally, Kilmacthomas, Co. Waterford
In all cases check box /or leave blank	
1. Does the proposed development come within the definition of a 'project' for the purposes of EIA? (For the purposes of the Directive, "Project" means: - The execution of construction works or of other installations or schemes, - Other interventions in the natural surroundings and landscape including those involving the extraction of mineral resources)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a 'Project'. Proceed to Q2.
	<input type="checkbox"/> No, No further action required.
2. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 1, Schedule 5 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended)?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, it is a Class specified in Part 1. EIA is mandatory. No Screening required. EIAR to be requested. Discuss with ADP.	State the Class here
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Class specified in Part 1. Proceed to Q3	
3. Is the proposed development of a CLASS specified in Part 2, Schedule 5, Planning and Development Regulations 2001 (as amended) OR a prescribed type of proposed road development under Article 8 of Roads Regulations 1994, AND does it meet/exceed the thresholds?	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the development is not of a Class Specified in Part 2, Schedule 5 or a prescribed type of proposed road	

<p>development under Article 8 of the Roads Regulations, 1994.</p> <p>No Screening required.</p>	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class and meets/exceeds the threshold.</p> <p>EIA is Mandatory. No Screening Required</p>	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, the proposed development is of a Class but is sub-threshold.</p> <p>Preliminary examination required. (Form 2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Schedule 7A information submitted proceed to Q4. (Form 3 Required)</p>	<p>State the Class and state the relevant threshold</p> <p>Class 10(b)(i) Construction of more than 500 dwelling units.</p>

<p>4. Has Schedule 7A information been submitted AND is the development a Class of Development for the purposes of the EIA Directive (as identified in Q3)?</p>	
<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Pre-screening determination conclusion remains as above (Q1 to Q3)</p>

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

Form 2 - EIA Preliminary Examination

Case Reference	ABP-322373-25
Proposed Development Summary	Construction of house, a garage, a waste water treatment system with all associated site works
Development Address	Ballykeroge, Stradbally, Kilmacthomas, Co. Waterford
This preliminary examination should be read with, and in the light of, the rest of the Inspector's Report attached herewith.	
Characteristics of proposed development (In particular, the size, design, cumulation with existing/ proposed development, nature of demolition works, use of natural resources, production of waste, pollution and nuisance, risk of accidents/disasters and to human health).	Briefly comment on the key characteristics of the development, having regard to the criteria listed. The development involves the construction of 1 no. house on a 0.34 ha site. The site is located in a rural area.
Location of development (The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by the development in particular existing and approved land use, abundance/capacity of natural resources, absorption capacity of natural environment e.g. wetland, coastal zones, nature reserves, European sites, densely populated areas, landscapes, sites of historic, cultural or archaeological significance).	Briefly comment on the location of the development, having regard to the criteria listed The site is not located in or immediately adjacent to any European site. The closest Natura 2000 sites are Mid-Waterford Coast SPA (Site Code 004193) located 2.3km south east of the site, Glendine Wood SAC (Site Code 002324) located 4.2km west of the site and Dungarvan Harbour SPA (Site Code 004032) located 4.6km southwest of the site.
Types and characteristics of potential impacts (Likely significant effects on environmental parameters, magnitude and spatial extent, nature of impact, transboundary, intensity and complexity, duration, cumulative effects and opportunities for mitigation).	Having regard to the characteristics of the development and the sensitivity of its location, consider the potential for SIGNIFICANT effects, not just effects. Localised construction impacts will be temporary. The proposed development would not give rise to waste, pollution or nuisances beyond what would normally be deemed acceptable.

Conclusion	
Likelihood of Significant Effects	Conclusion in respect of EIA
There is no real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	EIA is not required.
There is significant and realistic doubt regarding the likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	
There is a real likelihood of significant effects on the environment.	

Inspector: _____ Date: _____

DP/ADP: _____ Date: _____

(only where Schedule 7A information or EIAR required)

Appendix 3
Screening for Appropriate Assessment
Test for likely significant effects

Step 1: Description of the project and local site characteristics

Brief description of project	Construction of house, a garage, a waste water treatment system with all associated site works
Brief description of development site characteristics and potential impact mechanisms	The appeal site, with an area of 0.34 ha is located in open countryside. Site boundaries comprise hedgerows to the north and west and the site forms part of a larger agricultural field. See section 1 of inspectors report).
Screening report	N
Natura Impact Statement	N
Relevant submissions	None

Step 2. Identification of relevant European sites using the Source-pathway-receptor model

European Site (code)	Qualifying interests¹ Link to conservation objectives (NPWS, date)	Distance from proposed development (km)	Ecological connections²	Consider further in screening³ Y/N
Mid-Waterford Coast SPA (Site Code 004193)	Cormorant (Phalacrocorax carbo) Peregrine (Falco peregrinus) Herring Gull (Larus argentatus) Chough (Pyrrhocorax pyrrhocorax) Mid-Waterford Coast SPA National Parks & Wildlife Service	2.3km	None. There is no identifiable pathway between the proposed development and any European Site. Water supply is from a private well, waste water treatment is proposed via on site waste water treatment system and surface water will be drained by on site soakaway.	N
Glendine Wood SAC (Site Code 002324)	Vandenboschia speciosa (Killarney Fern)	4.2km	None. There is no identifiable pathway between the proposed development and any	N

	Glendine Wood SAC National Parks & Wildlife Service		European Site. Water supply is from a private well, waste water treatment is proposed via on site waste water treatment system and surface water will be drained by on site soakaway.	
--	--	--	---	--

¹ Summary description / **cross reference to NPWS website** is acceptable at this stage in the report

² Based on source-pathway-receptor: Direct/ indirect/ tentative/ none, via surface water/ ground water/ air/ use of habitats by mobile species

³if no connections: N

Conclude if the proposed development could result in likely significant effects on a European site

I conclude that the proposed development (alone) would not result in likely significant effects on Mid-Waterford Coast SPA (Site Code 004193) and Glendine Wood SAC (Site Code 002324). The proposed development would have no likely significant effect in combination with other plans and projects on any European site(s). No further assessment is required for the project. No mitigation measures are required to come to these conclusions.

Screening Determination

Finding of no likely significant effects

In accordance with Section 177U of the Planning and Development Act 2000 (as amended) and on the basis of the information considered in this AA screening, I conclude that the proposed development individually or in combination with other plans or projects would not be likely to give rise to significant effects on any European Site(s) in view of the conservation objectives of these sites and is therefore excluded from further consideration. Appropriate Assessment is not required.

This determination is based on:

- The nature and scale of the works
- Location-distance from nearest European site and lack of direct connections between the application site and the SAC/SPA
- Taking into account screening determination by the PA.

Appendix 4

WFD IMPACT ASSESSMENT STAGE 1: SCREENING

Step 1: Nature of the Project, the Site and Locality

An Bord Pleanála ref. no.	ABP-322373-25	Townland, address	Ballykeroge, Stradbally, Kilmacthomas, Co. Waterford
Description of project	It is proposed to construct a house, a garage, a waste water treatment system and all associated site works including surface water soakaway and vehicular entrance.		
Brief site description, relevant to WFD Screening,	The site has an area of 0.34 hectares and is located on agricultural land in the open countryside approximately xx km from xx 1.4. The Dalligan river is located approx. 450m south of the appeal site. The pattern of development in the area comprises detached houses and agricultural lands. There are no drainage ditches apparent in the appeal site. The site is generally flat. The Site Suitability Assessment Report submitted with the planning application indicates that the site contains deep well drained mineral soils with subsoil type sandstone till. The trial hole was excavated to a depth of 2.1m and water was not encountered. The National Soils Hydrology Map identifies the site as having well drained sandstone till soil type.		
Proposed surface water details	Proposed soakaway on site.		
Proposed water supply source & available capacity	Water supply to be provided by way of proposed well.		

Proposed wastewater treatment system & available capacity, other issues		Proposed on site waste water treatment plant				
Others?						
Step 2: Identification of relevant water bodies and Step 3: S-P-R connection						
Identified water body	Distance to (m)	Water body name(s) (code)	WFD Status	Risk of not achieving WFD Objective e.g.at risk, review, not at risk	Identified pressures on that water body	Pathway linkage to water feature (e.g. surface run-off, drainage, groundwater)
River Dalligan	450m south of site	River Dalligan_010 IE_SE_17D010300	High	Not at risk	None	Not hydrologically connected to surface watercourse
Groundwater Waterbody	Underlying site	Tramore IE_SE_G_146	High	Not at risk	None	Well drained soil conditions
Step 4: Detailed description of any component of the development or activity that may cause a risk of not achieving the WFD Objectives having regard to the S-P-R linkage.						

CONSTRUCTION PHASE							
No.	Component	Water body receptor (EPA Code)	Pathway (existing and new)	Potential for impact/ what is the possible impact	Screening Stage Mitigation Measure*	Residual Risk (yes/no) Detail	Determination** to proceed to Stage 2. Is there a risk to the water environment? (if 'screened' in or 'uncertain' proceed to Stage 2.
1.	Site clearance /construction	River Dalligan_010	None	None	None	No	Screened out
2.	Site clearance /construction	Tramore IE_SE_G_146	Drainage through soil/bedrock	Hydrocarbon spillages	Standard construction measures /conditions	No	Screened out
OPERATIONAL PHASE							
3.	Surface water run-off	River Dalligan_010	None	None	None	No	Screened out
4.	Groundwater discharge	Tramore IE_SE_G_146	None	None	None	No	Screened out
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE							
5.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

